

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. At the time of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-15 were pending. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Prior Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art (hereinafter “APA”) in view of <http://translation.langenberg.com> (hereinafter “Langenberg”). Claims 3, 6, 10, 13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Langenberg and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,987,402 to Murata et al. (hereinafter “Murata”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a translation server that includes “an information synthesizer for assembling the translation result sent from the translator, the retranslation instruction part produced by the information converter and the non-translation object part sent from the information separator and sending a synthesized result to the terminal.” Independent claims 8 and 14 include similar features. Thus, the invention as claimed recites the ability to translate and retranslate a document, and send the results from the translation, retranslation and non-translation objects to the terminal that requested the translation and retranslation.

The Examiner correctly asserts that APA fails to show an information converter that produces a retranslation result. However, APA was relied upon to teach the information synthesizer, which synthesizes the results of the translation and retranslation and also the non-translation object part from the original translation instruction. APA fails to teach the synthesis of the results of the translation and retranslation. Rather, APA teaches that “[T]he information synthesizer 140 synthesizes the translation result sent from the translator 130 and the non-text part T110 sent from the information separator 120 and sends the synthesized result to the terminal 200 as the access source.” (page 3, lines 27-31). There is no teaching or suggestion in APA that a retranslation object would also be synthesized in the translation result sent to the terminal.

Langenberg fails to make up for the deficiencies of APA as detailed above. First, Applicants would like to point out that just because the website cited in the Office Action has

a copyright that dates back to 1997, it is the functionality of the website that was available before January 18, 2002 that can be utilized in the rejection. Applicants attempted to test this functionality using the wayback machine (www.archive.org); however, testing of the translation was not possible. Thus, Applicants respectfully question the applicability of the Langenberg translation website as prior art for this application.

However, even if Langenberg were utilized as prior art, it would still not teach all of the features of the invention as claimed, either alone or in combination with APA. With Langenberg, a user enters initial source and target language information and the document information, and chooses to translate the document by clicking on the “Go” button. As a result, the translation of the document appears. The initial source and target language information and document information remain on the input web page. If the user desires to translate the document into another language, the user can change the target language of translation, and click on the “Go” button again to translate the document. The only results shown are the results of the retranslation of the document. The initial translation information is no longer shown. There is no teaching or suggestion in Langenberg that the results of the initial translation are kept, or synthesized with the results of the re-translation. Rather, each translation done by Langenberg seems to be a separate and distinct translation. This is not the case with the instant invention, in which the results of the translation and the retranslation are synthesized and sent as a synthesized result to the requesting terminal. Thus, Langenberg also fails to teach or suggest “an information synthesizer for assembling the translation result sent from the translator, the retranslation instruction part produced by the information converter and the non-translation object part sent from the information separator and sending a synthesized result to the terminal.”

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that neither APA nor Langenberg, either alone or in combination, teach or disclose all of the features of the invention as claimed. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where these features can be found in the cited prior art.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/30/08

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 59,597